

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing amendments, and reexamination and reconsideration of the subject application, and in light of the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

The courtesy of the telephonic interview with the new examiner is gratefully acknowledged.

Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended to include claim 9 and part of claim 5; claims 9 and 10 have been cancelled; claims 5 and 16 are amended in light of the amendment to claim 1. Accordingly, claims 1-4, 6-8, 11-15, 17, and 18 are now pending. No new matter is added.

Claim Interpretation

Applicants respectfully traverse the claim interpretation as stated in the final rejection and the interview summary from the previous examiner as unrealistic and not in accordance with the interpretation one of ordinary skill in the art would have reading the instant specification. For example, the claims do not read on a polymeric or resinous X-Y matrix when taken in context of the specification, and a "thin film" does not read on a thin polymeric film. Nevertheless, to move this application forward, applicants have amended claim 1 to specifically recite the that the X component includes at least one of the elements as previously recited in claim 9.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103

Applicants respectfully traverse the various rejections of the claims as obvious over WO '792, Iwasaki (*et al.*) and/or Yoshida (*et al.*), and Livshits (*et al.*). As noted above, the claims do not read on a resinous matrix, especially as now amended. As WO '792 and Livshits both disclose resinous matrices instead of the X-Y matrix as now claimed, the resinous layer of these

references cannot be considered a "thin film" as that term is used in the art and in the present claims. Additionally, the references do not teach M in a granular form dispersed in the claimed X-Y matrix, nor having the claimed loss properties. Therefore, these rejections should now be withdrawn.